## DURHAM CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION Thursday, January 4, 2018 @ 1:00 p.m. 2nd Floor Committee Room – 101 City Hall Plaza

Present: Mayor Steve Schewel, Mayor Pro Tempore Jillian Johnson and Council Members Vernetta Alston, DeDreana Freeman, Mark-Anthony Middleton and Charlie Reece. Absent: None.

Also present: City Manager Tom Bonfield, City Attorney Patrick Baker and Acting City Clerk Diana Schreiber.

Mayor Schewel called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance.

#### [ANNOUNCEMENTS BY COUNCIL]

Council Member Reece requested the Acting City Clerk to review and confirm the residency information of an applicant for the council vacancy, Ann-Drea Small.

#### [PRIORITY ITEMS BY CITY MANAGER, ATTORNEY AND CLERK]

Mayor Schewel asked for priority items from the City Manager, City Attorney and Acting City Clerk.

City Manager Bonfield stated that Agenda Item #6 (Transit Amenities Repair and Installation Contract) has been referred back to the administration; and Item #10 (Contract ST-285 for 2018 Street Repairs and Repaving) reminded Council there was a presentation accompanying the item.

**MOTION** by Council Member Reece, seconded by Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson, to approve the City Manager's priority items as stated. The motion was approved unanimously.

City Attorney Baker had no priority items.

Acting City Clerk Schreiber had no priority items; responded to Council Member Reece's inquiry about the residency of vacancy applicant, Ann-Drea Small that according to the Durham County Board of Elections, Ms. Small had moved to a new residence located at 2622 Mansfield Avenue, Durham, in Ward 2, as of one month ago; and confirmed the location was within the City of Durham's municipal limits.

#### [ADMINISTRATIVE CONSENT ITEMS]

Mayor Schewel announced each item on the printed agenda; and stated the following items were pulled for further discussion and/or action by the City Council: Item #2, Award of Home Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) Funds to CASA (Formerly Known as Community Alternatives for Supportive Abodes) for Permanent Affordable Housing; Item #5, Grant Agreement for the Downtown Durham Wayfinding Program (C-5605h); Item #7, 2018 - 2021 Employee Benefits Recommendations; and Item #8, Request to Amend the 2016 High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) Grant Project Ordinance #15178; and Item #10, Contract ST-285 for 2018 Street Repairs and Repaving.

# SUBJECT: AWARD OF HOME COMMUNITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (CHDO) FUNDS TO CASA (FORMERLY KNOWN AS COMMUNITY ALTERNATIVES FOR SUPPORTIVE ABODES) FOR PERMANENT AFFORDABLE HOUSING (ITEM #2)

Mayor Schewel requested additional information on the item from Community Development staff; addressed his inquiry to Assistant City Manager Chadwell; inquired about how the supportive services would be provided to the formerly homeless individuals with disabilities and which entities would provide the services.

Mr. Chadwell stated the project configuration of the units was standard to a CASA development; explained that typically services would be offered in house; and stated confirmation of those services would be provided to Council after the meeting.

Mayor Schewel made an observation about Items #3 and 4; stated the two items were very expensive and each included over \$100,000 of the Dedicated Housing Fund; explained there remained a need for a comprehensive affordable housing strategy with price targets that Council intended to build.

Mr. Chadwell explained the preservation strategy was long-term for Southeast and Central Durham and that Council would receive updates.

Mayor Pro Tempore stated that the land trust housing units were permanently affordable even though the units were relatively expensive; and this fact needed to be considered when making cost calculations.

### SUBJECT: GRANT AGREEMENT FOR THE DOWNTOWN DURHAM WAYFINDING PROGRAM (C-5605H) (ITEM #5)

Council Member Reece inquired about the wayfinding signage and directed his inquiry to Transportation Engineer Peter Nicholas.

Council Member Reece asked if the signage was compatible with what was currently installed in the Downtown core; requested more details on the term, 'upscale version'; and asked about the costs of the existing signage for comparative purposes.

Mr. Nicholas explained the signage would reflect an upscale version of the signage currently in use, would be easier to modify and could guide persons to relocated facilities if needed; explained upscale involved a branded sign system and that a committee was to be organized consisting of Downtown stakeholders to select the design committee, the design itself and the city would handle construction; and responded he did not have the costs of existing signage but could research and forward the information to the Council Member.

Council Member Freeman requested that North Carolina Central University's (NCCU) Graphic Design Department students be represented in the group of stakeholders.

Mr. Nicholas agreed to reach out to NCCU and release the list of stakeholders to Council.

#### SUBJECT: 2018 – 2021 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS RECOMMENDATIONS (ITEM #7)

Regina Youngblood, Director of Human Resources, responded to questions regarding the proposal; and confirmed there were no changes to the proposal.

Mayor Schewel announced the city was moving to a new health care administrator, AETNA with an estimated savings for the city of \$3.5 million; anticipated that the employees would receive better care options; referred to the difficult negotiations conducted three years ago; and appreciated the process utilized this year.

Council Member Freeman appreciated the inclusion of union representatives.

City Manager Bonfield confirmed there was a significant savings to the city and employees.

Ms. Youngblood explained there would be savings derived from the city's partnership with AETNA with special mention to the cost savings within the core and basic plans; when employees moved to the AETNA whole health plan they would save in terms of deductibles, premiums and out of pocket, averaging \$57 per month. She introduced the other insurance vendors across the benefit strata.

Mayor Schewel encouraged patience during this time of transition to the new insurance administrator, AETNA.

## SUBJECT: REQUEST TO AMEND THE 2016 HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS (HIDTA) GRANT PROJECT ORDINANCE #15178 (ITEM #8)

Council Member Alston requested information from Assistant Chief Ed Sarvis, Police Department; asked about terms 'high intensity' and 'specific center of illegal activity' as defined in the federal grant program; and asked about metrics, statistics or rates of drug trafficking rates.

City Manager Bonfield asked that Assistant Chief Sarvis clarify the city's role as a regional fiscal agent.

Assistant Chief Sarvis confirmed the program was federal; explained that Durham had been named as fiduciary for the middle and eastern districts of North Carolina, and reported to the Atlanta/Carolinas region; and summarized that Durham managed the money for those federal areas.

Council Member Middleton inquired about language in the memo that referred to the program being intelligence driven.

Assistant Chief Sarvis explained the program was intended to address high level, drug supplier type operations and investigations.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson understood this was an extension of an existing grant; asked if the city was anticipating seeking out the same source of money in the future; and if so, she would like Council to have a larger conversation about the grant at that time.

Assistant Chief Sarvis confirmed that the grant existed and was not certain if the city would reapply for the grant in the future; and acknowledged a broader conversation could be arranged.

City Manager Bonfield explained that if another grant was applied for, the grant application would have to come before Council for approval and in order to move ahead.

## SUBJECT: CONTRACT ST-285 FOR 2018 STREET REPAIRS AND REPAVING (ITEM #10)

Tasha Johnson, Assistant Director of Public Works, gave the staff report with a PowerPoint presentation; discussed the status of the city's street repairs and repaving projects; shared the new strategy focused on pavement preservation instead of worst/first approach and compared the differences between the two models; explained the pavement preservation strategy to apply the right treatment to the right street at the right time during the street's life cycle and that pavement preservation kept the overall roadway network in good condition for longer periods of time, at lower costs, by conducting intermittent repairs of crack sealing, chip seal, pavement rejuvenation, micro surfacing, patches and short overlays; and clarified the pavement condition index and exhibited photos of the various treatments.

Ms. Johnson compared treatment with lane mile units of measure, pavement condition index (PCI) and displayed the condition of roads with a pavement category study; noted the average street would be maintained at PCI of 65, a rating level that was recommended by the previous Council; and emphasized that as the intermittent treatment model matured, more money would be available to be spent on the maintenance of more roads on an annual basis.

Mayor Schewel inquired about the treatment needed for severe pavement repairs.

Ms. Johnson responded that was achieved with partial def or full def payment repair combined with full overlay in isolated sections and depending on sub surface condition, certain sections could be dealt with chip seal or micro definition.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson inquired about balancing roadways aesthetics versus drivability; and asked if complaint driven processes often dealt with the appearance of roadways even though the streets were structurally sound.

Ms. Johnson responded, 'Yes' and stated that roadway maintenance was not about making streets look better but was a method to extend their longevity.

Ms. Johnson addressed the usage of street funds by explaining that a total \$6.6 million in revenues received for road way construction; of that, a quarter was used for preservation of residential streets in defined geographic areas. She noted that the contract allowed for 54 lane miles of work and the average cost per lane mile was trending down and spoke to coordinating roadway repairs with Water Resources and General Services to avoid tearing open newly paved roadways.

Ms. Johnson explained the timeline of the project once Council approval was received that spanned from April to October 2018 and indicated that additional expenses were often required to bring curb ramps to ADA standard, curb and gutter repair and provide for traffic control.

Council Member Freeman asked if funds were set aside for the city's worst roadways, how were the roads scheduled for maintenance and was PCI utilized as a basis for maintenance scheduling.

Ms. Johnson explained that a study had been conducted of all roads in the city that assigned roadway PCIs with recommended scheduling of repairs; and indicated that PCI was not the sole determinant to repairs since there may not be any residential along the lower PCI scored roadways.

Council member Freeman asked staff to keep Council updated on improvements so that Council could plan ahead for large street construction expenditures.

Council Member Middleton addressed functionality and appearance, spoke to the psychological impression that citizens may have about the appearance of the roadways in their neighborhoods where the roads did not appear to be as well kept as usual and could interpret the city's new policy as a way to scientifically not maintain the roads as expected; and inquired how long it would take for the city to realize savings from the new strategy.

Ms. Johnson provided examples of recent maintenance with the expected budgetary impacts.

City Manager Bonfield asked if the treatments and the selected areas were listed on the city's website.

Ms. Johnson affirmed that the information would be on the Public Works project website along with additional outreach provided by Public Affairs in the form of community meetings.

Council Member Freeman requested a map be posted online so that citizens could see if their neighborhood would be impacted and how along with a list of roads and scheduled improvements.

Ms. Johnson explained the amount of revenues received for FY17 was \$3 million and in FY18, \$6.6 million.

Ms. Johnson displayed before and after photographs of various roadway treatments and the results of roadway curing; spoke to micro-resurfacing and traditional asphalt of Broad Street with the end results; mentioned the use of a new process called cape seal involving tar and gravel with micro-surfacing overlay; and explained reclamite, a rejuvenator for roads of 1-3 years of age, involved spraying compounds and covering them with sand, this technique extended the life of the road by approximately five years.

Ms. Johnson explained that there would be communications with PACs in the form of social media, message boards, workzone signage, city's website and face to face meetings with the HOAs prior to the mobilization of equipment.

Council Member Reece suggested using the NextDoor app and Neighborhood Listservs.

Council Member Freeman suggested reaching out to NIS community engagement coordinators to spread the word by using door hangers and listserves.

Ms. Johnson displayed a map and indicated the future street projects and highlighted work planned for Carver Street, the Police Headquarters, Roxboro Street and various neighborhoods in between; reiterated the information would be posted on the Public Works Project website; stated that staff would be updating the pavement condition study with work being underway by Spring 2018.

City Manager Bonfield requested Director of Public Works Marvin Williams to address the work of city crews associated with pothole and street repairs and how the requests were received and prioritized.

Mr. Williams spoke to the practices of the maintenance division, explained calls came in through Durham One Call, Council Offices and Public Works; some milling/paving was handled by Public Works workforce; explained the city shared the rental of heavy equipment with other municipalities and NCDOT; his staff handled utility service repairs on asphalt, pavement failures in small sections and contracted maintenance on state roads within the city limits; stated that typically major thoroughfares were state owned but the city was contracted to care for 200 miles of state roads within the city limits by assisting with pothole repair, snow removal and mowing operations.

Council Member Reece spoke to his success with using the Durham One Call App that consisted of the complaint driven process; stated he was happy with city crew responses and appreciated the work done to make repairs quickly and with a high level of professionalism.

Council Member Freeman concurred and stated that response times had improved over the past five years.

Mr. Williams appreciated the comments and would relay the commendations to his maintenance crews.

Mayor Schewel made an observation for the benefit of the new councilmembers regarding the bond issue of 2010; explained that a lot of work was done immediately after the former bond was approved; then capital funds were provided at a low level and the streets deteriorated; now this fiscal year, the city had doubled the amount of money put into street maintenance; according to the city survey, residents were most interested in and were dissatisfied with road conditions; this was the reason Council decided to spend more money on roadways; he complimented the report, thanked staff and appreciated innovation being brought to the expenditure.

City Manager Bonfield asked Mr. Williams to address the roadway reconstruction projects in Ravenstone and Stone Hill Estates.

Mr. Williams addressed the two developments that consisted of pavement projects that had failed; explained the city went in to repair the streets that had been left undone by the developer and brought remaining streets that had been completed up to a better condition; he explained that street employees used the microsurfacing process with curing, and fortunately, the results would blend with the new construction; explained that there had been some complaints about the look of the resurfacing; stated that the contractor would re-do some work in Stone Hill Estates that was not up to standard; summarized that after one year of curing, the finished products would look and ride the same as traditionally paved streets; and added the project would be taken care of in the Spring 2018.

Council Member Freeman encouraged NIS to conduct outreach to help residents understand the impending surface treatments along with the objectives of those treatments.

Representatives from the Fred Davis Company, spoke about the company's asphalt manufacturing; explained the company did not handle roadway treatments; and explained that subcontractors typically handled those treatments.

Council Member Middleton addressed the fact that the Fred Smith Company did not meet the minority participation goal on workforce diversity and asked how staff had operationalized the good faith effort.

Deputy City Manager Wanda Page explained the good faith effort process that was detailed in the Equal Opportunity ordinance; and explained how EOEA staff handled operationalizing the ordinance and the formula used to determine if the contractor met the good faith contracting criteria or not.

Mayor Schewel explained that the good faith effort was applicable to sub-contractors' workforce; the ordinance covered disadvantaged business contractors; and at some point, it would be good to have a presentation by Debra Giles, EOEA who could explain how contracting was covered by good faith effort certification and workforce statistics.

Ms. Page explained the EOEA ordinance had been updated within the past four years in was in effect with the Disparity Study that became effective April 1, 2017.

Council Member Freeman asked if there was a way to track African American women, Latino and Asian women contractors.

Ms. Page explained that the goals were set through the NC Hub Office, who registered businesses in the various categories and if the contractor met the criteria, then that was how contrators were contracted out; and emphasized the city did not reclassify a company's certification through the Hub Office.

Mayor Schewel noted that the minority and women owned businesses were not from Durham; to increase the city's usage of minority and women owned businesses, staff was casting a wider net that included the statewide registry; it was typical that the city did not use many Durham based minority and women owned businesses; and it was an issue that Council needed to address- how to develop Durham women and minority owned businesses who could qualify for city contracts.

Council Member Freeman encouraged the Mayor's Council for Women to be a part of this research.

#### SUBJECT: SETTLING THE AGENDA

City Manager Bonfield reference the following items to be placed on the January 16, 2018 City Council Meeting agenda: Consent Items 1-5 and 7-11 along with General Business Agenda-Public Hearing Item #12; and Item #6 (Transit Amenities Repair and Installation Contract) was referred to the Administration.

**MOTION** by Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson, seconded by Council Member Reece, to accept the settled agenda; the motion passed unanimously.

Prior to adjourning the Work Session, Mayor Schewel updated the Council and public on the City Clerk search process; stated the process was rescheduled due to inclement weather and that the new meeting schedule was itemized in the memo from Human Resource Director Regina Youngblood; indicated a Special Council Meeting would be held immediately following the Work Session at 2:25 p.m. and requested each Council member to bring his/her list of seven names for the at-large Council vacancy.

The Work Session adjourned at 2:17 p.m.

Diana Schreiber Acting City Clerk

#### DURHAM CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING Thursday, January 4, 2018 @ 2:25 p.m. 2nd Floor Committee Room – 101 City Hall Plaza

Present: Mayor Steve Schewel, Mayor Pro Tempore Jillian Johnson and Council Members Vernetta Alston, DeDreana Freeman, Mark-Anthony Middleton and Charlie Reece. Absent: None.

Also present: City Manager Tom Bonfield, City Attorney Patrick Baker and Acting City Clerk Diana Schreiber.

Mayor Schewel called the Special Meeting to order; explained the process of balloting to be utilized for the applicants for the vacancy of the At-Large Member of Council; the Clerk received the names of seven candidates from each Council member and made a list comprised of the individuals receiving votes by each Council member combined with the number of votes each individual received; after this information was announced, Council would then decide how to proceed.

Council Member Reece suggested the Clerk provide the number of candidates that were in each vote category before knowing the names of the candidates; then if a natural break point occurred, Council could establish a cut-off.

Mayor Schewel summarized the process that each candidate would be announced by the number of votes he/she received and the names would not be divulged until later in the meeting. The Clerk was given the votes from each of the six council members for tallying purposes; the Clerk's staff tallied up the votes from Council.

While the Clerk's Office staff tallied up the votes for Council's at large vacancy seat, Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson demonstrated rank choice vote of a winning color; a total of 18 ballots were collected from the audience for demonstrative purposes.

Council Member Reece inquired if the ballots would be made public.

City Attorney Baker indicated the ballots were public record.

Council Member Middleton expressed his interest in the gravity of the public process. Council Member Reece confirmed that the role in the process was to safeguard the interests of all in the city.

Mayor Schewel reviewed the at-large vacancy meeting schedule; Wednesday, January  $10^{th}$  – public comment on the seven finalists by supporters of the candidates; speakers were invited to speak for 15 minutes in support of each candidate; Thursday, January  $11^{th}$  – 5 pm in Committee Room for interviews of up to seven candidates by the

Council; January 16<sup>th</sup> – 5:30 pm in the Committee Room to select the candidate for the Council vacancy; January 11<sup>th</sup> 7 p.m. the new Council Member will be sworn in.

Mayor Schewel updated Council with the change of schedule for the City Clerk search: Assessment Center was to be conducted on Thursday, Feb 1; Steve Straus, Developmental Associates, would provide analysis of the Assessment Center results on Friday, Feb. 2 at noon – 2:30 pm in closed session; and Friday, Feb. 9<sup>th</sup>, 2-5 pm was set to interview the City Clerk candidates with Council deciding on or around that date.

After the meeting updates, Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson demonstrated the rank choice voting process; indicated that a category had to receive the majority to win with the bottom vote getter being eliminated; then second place votes were shifted into the spaces made available by eliminating the bottom vote getters, after which the tally was reassessed; if a four way tie resulted between four colors, a random generator was utilized to determine who would win from the tied four; the process continued where the lowest votes were eliminated and winners of the tied colors were randomly generated and the forerunners were retained. After demonstrating the rank choice process, the winning color was 'olive'.

Council discussed the use of rank choice voting and random generation in elections.

Council Member Reece expressed concerns about the complexity of administering rank choice voting.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson stated there was on-line software to handle the process; and explained that the instant-run off portion could be conducted publicly by Council, whereby the number of votes each person was receiving would be announced as the voting proceeded.

Council Member Middleton described the process as exotic; asked how the previous vacancy was filled; and was not certain what voting model was utilized to determine the successful council candidate the last time.

Council Member Freeman expressed support for the rank choice model and opined that the same outcome would result from majority voting and rank choice voting.

The tally arrived from the Clerk's Office. The Clerk summarized the 42 votes (seven from each of the six council members): 3 persons received six votes; 2 persons received five votes; 2 persons received 4 votes; 2 persons received 2 votes; 2 persons received one vote; it was the consensus of Council to eliminate the persons who received one and two votes and seven persons remained.

It was the consensus of Council to take the seven persons who received the highest number of votes.

The Clerk announced the names of the vote tally.

Mayor Schewel summarized the persons receiving six votes: Maria del Pilar Rocha-Goldberg, Carl Rist and Kaaren Haldeman; persons receiving 5 votes: Sheila Huggins, Pierce Freelon; and persons receiving 4 votes: Sheila Arias and Javiera Caballero.

Mayor Schewel called for a vote to approve the field of seven candidates.

**MOTION** by Council Member Reece, seconded by Council Member Middleton, to approve the field of seven candidates was approved at 3:02 p.m.; the motion was approved unanimously.

Mayor Schewel returned to the discussion of the method to be utilized in order to select the final candidate on January 16<sup>th</sup>.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson admitted the quality of the seven candidates were excellent and spoke to the possibility of a tie from voting on seven strong candidates with six council members; rank choice was a way to make preferences clear for first, second and third place choices; favored rank choice because it allowed for the process to be clear and would allow a first preference to be incorporated into a voting process; it is more complex but there were videos online to teach rank choice voting; in late 2000s there was a pilot project for municipal elections in Cary. Mayor Pro Tem stated she preferred the process but understood if it was too much to deal with.

Council Member Middleton addressed the process; concurred there was an apparent strength of field, but noted the candidates had not yet been interviewed, and stated he was not prepared to exempt or lessen concerns; then as process moved forward certain candidates would stand out or not; if the process came to a tie, there was a mechanism in place for a special election.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson addressed City Attorney Baker asking that if Council voted and a tie resulted, would Council have to go to a special election or not.

Attorney Baker explained that everything depended on what happened in the next meeting; and reiterated that a replacement had to be selected by February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2018.

Council Member Middleton stated that if there was a perpetual tie, and if the tie could not be negotiated, that a special election would result.

Mayor Schewel stated that if rank choice process was the process, he did not find it educative for the public and would be confusing to people and did not see the big advantage of rank choice. He explained that Council was fortunate to have such a great field of candidates and to feel comfortable, there had to be a more transparent process.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson exhibited the process on the screen with six choices of colors as a pilot of rank choice voting; votes that were eliminated in the first round were then exhausted in the later rounds; if a ballot was exhausted, none of a person's votes were considered in the final vote.

Council discussed their voting options- either rank choice that involved selecting the top two candidates and then picking between them; or vote by majority that involved casting ballots like the previous Council.

Council weighed the options and the potential scenarios that could result from rank choice and majority.

Mayor Schewel called for a vote on two iterations:

- 1. Rank choice voting as described by Mayor Pro Tempore.
- 2. Majority vote. A ballot where council would require a majority vote for a winner and where council would write down on paper ballot each individual choice; if there was a majority winner with four votes, that person would be elected; if not, take top two candidates would be voted on and the winner would win; if, however, there were three candidates with two votes each, there would be discussion and re-vote, if necessary. A tie would have to be talked through and re-vote.

If a candidate could not be chosen, then Council would hold a special election.

Mayor Schewel called for a vote on the option of rank choice voting.

**MOTION** by Council Member Freeman, seconded by Council Member Alston, to support rank choice voting died at 3:26 p.m. by the following vote: Ayes: Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson and Council Members Alston and Freeman. Nays: Mayor Schewel and Council Members Middleton and Reece.

Council continued discussing the advantages and disadvantages of the voting models.

Council Member Alston was deterred about appointing someone with three votes; however, the complicated nature of rank choice was not a deterrent.

Mayor Schewel stated the rank choice process was confusing to the public and the benefits were slim.

Council Member Middleton explained there was a template of how the process worked before, he did not see a compelling case to utilize rank choice; given the public sentiment regarding the process, there seemed to be a less exotic and simpler path to successfully yield a council person to fill the vacant seat.

Council Member Alston favored modelling the rank choice process that constituted a fairer system that potentially could be useful for the city.

Council Member Freeman addressed various scenarios involving tied votes.

Mayor Pro Tem Johnson explained that the rank choice model was not approved for use by the NC General Assembly so this opportunity to use rank choice voting to select the at-large seat was the only time possible to utilize the method.

Council Member Reece expressed concerns about exhausted ballot, a situation that could arise with a three vote getting successful winner and was not certain if that satisfied Council's requirement for a successful winner; stated it was not appropriate for Mayor Pro Tempore to sort data sheets and tally results during a meeting; if utilizing a random generation program, there would be question as to who wrote the program and questions its programming.

Mayor Pro Tempore indicated that if Council ranked seven instead of three candidates, the exhausted ballot issue would not arise but that there would be multiple iterations.

Council Member Middleton preferred a substantive debate with his colleagues rather than going immediately to his second choice; and favored the give and take with his colleagues in debating other choices.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson proposed that Council rank their top three, then eliminate everyone but the top two in one round, then they would have either a winner or a three-three tie; at that juncture, Council would discuss the options. She then reiterated support for ranking all seven candidates.

Council Member Middleton expressed support for voting on the seven names and seeing if a majority resulted.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson explained her proposal was to rank their top three people then eliminate all but the top two in one round.

Council Member Freeman favored ranking three and moving forward.

Mayor Schewel summarized Mayor Pro Tempore's plan for Council was to rank three persons, if there was a clear majority, there would be a winner; however, if no one received a clear majority, then take second place votes and eliminate all but the top two persons; then take all of second place votes and add them to the first place of whoever got the first place votes; whoever came out with majority at that point, would win or else there would be a tie.

Additional discussion ensued regarding exhausted ballots.

Council Member Alston was concerned about achieving the goal of utilizing rank choice voting which the current discussion did not model.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson explained the goal she was trying to achieve was a method that everyone would be ok with rather than teaching rank choice voting; did not have knowledge about eliminating all but the top two in the first round; and that if a tie resulted, there would be more conversation prior to going automatically to a run-off.

Council Member Middleton explained the rank will be built in to the majority vote process and the majority vote process seems simpler.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson, in interest in not belaboring the process any longer, agreed to the majority vote process.

**MOTION** by Council Member Middleton, seconded by Council Member Reece, that Council use majority vote was approved at 3:44 p.m. by the following vote: Ayes: Mayor Schewel, Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson, and Council Members Middleton and Reece. Nays: Council Members Alston and Freeman.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Diana Schreiber Acting City Clerk